IRIS AperTO

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Job uncertainty and leaving the parental home in Italy Longitudinal analysis of the effect of labour market insecurity on the propensity to leave the parental household among youth

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1708869 since 2021-03-09T15:16:39Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1108/IJSSP-05-2019-0096

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

20 November 2026

Job Uncertainty and Leaving the Parental Home in Italy.
Longitudinal Analysis of the Effect of Labour Market Insecurity on the Propensity to Leave the Parental Household among Youth.

THIS FILE IS IS POST-PRINT VERSION OF THE ARTICLE PUBLISHED IN "International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy" (ISSN: 0144-333X), available at:
https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/IJSSP-05-2019-0096/full/html

Authors:
Sonia Bertolini,
Department of Cultures, Politics and Society, University of Turin (IT)
Lungo Dora Siena 100, Torino (IT)
sonia.bertolini@unito.it

Valentina Goglio
Department of Cultures, Politics and Society, University of Turin (IT)
Lungo Dora Siena 100, Torino (IT)
valentina.goglio@unito.it

Abstract
Purpose This paper analyzes whether and to what extent, the labour market situation of young Italians affects their chances of exiting the parental home, differentiating between leaving parental home with or without a partner. The paper also considers whether contextual factors, such as the occurrence of the economic crisis, and family-related characteristics might play a moderating role. The main focus is to understand if new modes of becoming adult are emerging in a country in which leaving home occurs relatively late and where family ties are at the same time a source of protection and a source of reproduction of inequalities.
Design/methodology/approach
The paper uses longitudinal data from EU-SILC for the period 2007 to 2014 and applies Event History Analysis techniques for discrete time data. The analyses estimate the hazard rate of leaving the parental home for a sample of Italian individuals in the age range of 16 to 40 who, at the beginning of the observation period, were living with their parents.
Findings
The empirical analyses highlight a negative association between exclusion from the labour market and housing autonomy, robust and consistent across gender and across types of transition. On the contrary, a situation of objective job insecurity does not emerge as being associated to lower chances of housing autonomy, compared to individuals with job stability. Moreover, the educational background of the family of origin does not show any mediating role on the relative disadvantage of unemployed and inactive individuals; while the relative disadvantage of inactive individuals tends to further worsen in the period after the economic crisis (2010-14).
Originality/value
The paper contributes to the study of transitions to housing autonomy by differentiating between two modes: in couple or alone. Moreover, by introducing information on the educational background of parents and the time effect, the paper aims to combine different traditions of research coming from the sociology of work, family, and inequalities.

Keywords
Youth, leaving home, transition to adult life, job insecurity,

Acknowledgment
This project has received funding from the European Union Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No. 649496.

1. Introduction

Leaving the home of origin is regarded as one of the key markers of the transition to adulthood (Corijn and Klijzing, 2001; Shanahan, 2000). It implies not only housing independence but also greater social autonomy for young people (Billari et al., 2001). It also improves opportunities to plan for the future and make important lifetime decisions, such as forming a family of one's own (Aassve et al., 2002; Avery et al., 1992).
Theoretical literature, which explains incentives for, and constraints on leaving the parental home, views the opportunity to leave as being determined by the level of individual resources available directly to young adults (Ermisch, 1999; McElroy, 1985).
The risk of losing employment and the associated negative consequences for the standard of living are much stronger for those who decide to establish one's own household as compared to youth that stay home with their parents (Aassve et al., 2007; Parisi, 2008). This transition reduces opportunities to receive material and emotional support from the family of origin. Therefore, if young people experience difficulties in labour market integration and perceive their situation as unstable and insecure, they may be relatively less willing to take such a step. Specifically, unemployed or inactive youth may have very limited opportunities to leave the parental home, especially in countries with limited state support for them (Aassve et al., 2002). However, chances for housing independence from parents may vary strongly, also among those young people who are actually involved in paid work. In particular, the attention of researchers has recently turned towards the role of stability of employment (Barbieri et al., 2014; Becker et al., 2010; Fernandes et al., 2008). Labour market positions with high degrees of economic uncertainty prevent youth from making blind long-term commitments (Mills and Blossfeld, 2003; Oppenheimer et al., 1997). Thus, irrespective of the level of income received by young adults, the expected variation in income may deter them from investing in household formation (Fernandes et al., 2008).
Another important factor in this respect is that temporary jobs produce wage discounts, namely lower levels of income (e.g. due to lower bargaining power), and wage scars through the employment history of individuals employed with a temporary position (e.g. due to limited promotion chances) (Gebel, 2009). Several studies showed the negative effects of job precariousness on the propensity of youth to leave the parental household, but also the variability of this impact among European Countries (for a review see Baranowska-Rataj et al., 2015). In Southern European countries, characterized by a familist welfare model, the rise in labour market uncertainty has contributed to the postponement of the transition to adult life for young people, but the magnitude of such a repercussion has varied across countries and suggested that this depends on the specific national institutional context (Blossfeld et al., 2005, 2012). As an example, in Southern-European countries, where welfare systems are less generous than those of Scandinavian countries in supporting individuals from job loss or in housing costs, the relationship between the labour market condition and the transition to residential autonomy has been found to be stronger (Ranci et al., 2014). Part of the literature underlined that young people with different levels of education used different strategies for leaving the parental home in different institutional contexts (Bertolini et al., 2014, 2018b).

This paper investigates the transition to housing autonomy, defined as the transition out of parental home, looking at the effect of labour market flexibilization and exclusion, taking into account the modality of leaving home: with or without a partner. The focus is on Italy, to understand if there are new modalities of becoming adults in a country where family protection is particularly strong, at the same time acting as a source of protection and of reproduction of inequalities, and where the main way of leaving home is as a couple.

The paper is structured as follows. The second paragraph describes the institutional context and the literature background that frames the hypotheses; the third paragraph illustrates the empirical strategy of analysis with a detail on data and method used; the fourth paragraph presents the main findings, which will be further discussed in the conclusions.

2. The institutional context

In Italy, there has been a late and rapid introduction of flexible forms of employment without adequate 'buffering' through simultaneous social security reform assuring access to social security to temporary workers, just as for permanent workers. These reforms resulted in strong market segmentation between outsiders and insiders (Regini, 2000). Workers employed with permanent contracts, especially in large companies, can often benefit from a high level of social protection: protection covering illness or unemployment benefits in the event of periods of unemployment, whereas there has been only a low level of social protection for flexible workers who, for example, are not entitled to unemployment benefits between one contract and another, or to periods paid during absence due to illness (Blossfeld et al., 2012).
The Italian system of welfare is weak and has had an exclusive role of the family of origin in supporting young people towards this transition (Ascoli et al., 2015; Bertolini, 2011; Bertolini and al. 2018; Colombo and Rebughini, 2019; Fullin, 2005; Mencarini Letizia and Tanturri Maria Letizia, 2006; Negri and Filandri, 2010; Filandri, Nazio 2017; Reyneri, 2017). Postponement takes longer in Italy and it might be because this country has a less universalistic welfare state compared to, as an example, Scandinavian countries (Barbieri and Scherer, 2009). Youth policies have thus remained largely fragmented and delegated, in their implementation, to regions, without a real national plan of coordination and, above all, without an integration with other policies, such as education, employment, and family policies (Antonucci et al., 2014; Cordella and Masi, 2012).
Empirical literature found a significant and positive impact of the employment status, of the type of employment and level of income on the transition out of the parental home, especially stronger for Italian men (Aassve et al., 2002; Bertolini, 2011). Additionally, getting married is considered the traditional way to housing autonomy and was found to be negatively associated to unemployment and temporary contracts, especially for men. Moreover, economic and job insecurity were less important for women, so that unemployed or inactive women did not have a lesser chance of getting married (Bernardi and Nazio, 2005; Filandri, Nazio , 2017; Bettio et al., 2013). In general, in countries, "…where the male-breadwinner model is predominant, it will be more important for males to establish themselves in a secure job as opposed to females…" (Blossfeld et al., 2005, p. 19).
In the literature focused on Italy, the relation between labor market flexibilization and family formation was analysed from two perspectives (Bertolini, 2011): the role of the family was described as providing protection for those who had an unstable job or a lack of adequate institutional support (Fullin, 2005; Reyneri, 2017). In this sense, it may be argued that in Italy, the family substitutes the welfare state. On the other hand, it has been pointed out that unstable jobs can slow down family formation among young people. For young adults, one of the consequences of remaining in atypical employment is the postponement of important decisions in their private and family lives, whereas the length of postponement depends on the institutional context (Bertolini et al., 2014, 2015; Rizza, 2002).

In addition to the above, the effects of employment precariousness on family formation vary according to both social class and the level of education. In fact, young people with a high level of education tend to stay longer in the family of origin while studying, because of the lack of economic support for mobility and allowances for students. Young people in Italy also tend to stay in the family of origin while looking for their first job, due to the fact that early entrance to the labour market lacks access to unemployment protection (Bertolini, 2011). Young people coming from families of a high social class can count on cultural and economic support from their family also while they are working with a temporary contract. However, part of literature focusing on cultural capital underlined that the family background of parents also influences attitudes toward leaving home: parents with a higher level of education are more prone to encourage the autonomy of their children,

resulting in a tendency to leave home earlier by their children (Franchi, 2005). There are also differences across European countries in this respect (Bertolini et al., 2018b). At the same time, Barbera et al. (2010) and Negri and Filandri (2010) found that middle-class males in Italy implemented a waiting strategy by which postponing the exit from parental home in order to wait for entering high quality job positions (Reyneri, 2017). On the other hand, young people coming from a low social class, usually also with a low educational level, cannot enjoy cultural and economic protection from the family of origin and must accept any type of job.

Despite increases in this incidence, consensual unions are also comparatively less common in Italy than in other European countries (Billari et al., 2001; Nazio and Blossfeld, 2003). Thus, late home-leaving may also be related to the fact that young people less frequently choose to form a partnership through a consensual union. Some authors stressed the importance of analysing separately the time of leaving the parental home with or without a partner. This is because one of the main motivations to leave the parental home, especially in Italy, is still to form a new family (Barbagli et al., 2004; Billari et al., 2001; Colombo and Rebughini, 2019; Negri and Filandri, 2010; Rusconi, 2006). Some studies analysed the relation between social class and the modality of leaving the parental home, alone or in couple. In general, coming from higher social classes increases the probability of leaving alone or without marriage (Filandri, 2012).

However, in Italy different models of leaving the parental home tend to emerge today. If it is true that young people tend to stay longer in parental home - Italy is the European country in which people leave home later – since the that family is a provider of social protection, it is also true that the percentage of marriage decreased (the crude marriage rate ranges from 4.3% in 2005 to 3.2% in 2017), as well as the percentage of children born outside of the marriage increases (from 16% in 2006 to 28% in 2016) (Eurostat, 2019a, 2019b).
Besides economic conditions, cultural traits contribute to describe differences in the timing of leaving the parental home. Italy is often defined as a strong family culture where an extended period of intergenerational co-residence is considered part of the socialization of offspring (Dalla Zuanna 2001; Reher 1998). In Italy and other Southern European countries where traditionally the family group has had priority over the individual, co-residence is the most important way for parents and their adult children to exchange mutual support (Albertini and Kohli 2013). In Italy intergenerational co-residence is an adaptive strategy to prevent poverty, particularly among lower social classes and families living in areas with high unemployment (Micheli and Rosina 2009). The effect of economic constraints is partly due to a weak welfare state that provides insufficient protection to young people. In addition, a restricted rental market tends to negatively moderate the association between unemployment and housing autonomy (Bertolini et al., 2018a), as well as the low availability of mortgages significantly which affect the decision to postpone the transition out of the family nest (Mulder and Billari, 2010). Moreover, given the reliance of young Italian adults on the family as the provider of welfare, parents are likely to exert an important influence on their children's choices (Tosi, 2017, Bertolini, 2018b). An open question is whether age norms continue to play a role in affecting home-leaving decisions in Italy, where the transition to independence is instead becoming de-standardized. A study shows that because of the very high economic risks of leaving parental home, youth seems still to be influenced by parental norms and waiting to be in couple to leave the parental home (Tosi, 2017) .
So far, analysis looking at the effects of individual labour market position on leaving the parental home have been separated from analyses focusing on the modes of leaving parental home, as a couple or without a partner. This paper will try to combine both approaches, with the aim of identifying different ways of transition to adult life.

Hypotheses
Given this background, the aim of the paper is to investigate how labour market exclusion and objective insecurity affect the transition out of the parental home for young Italians. Using longitudinal data, the paper investigates whether and to what extent, labour market conditions have influenced the

attainment of housing autonomy, distinguishing between exiting the parental home with a partner or alone, also paying attention to contextual factors such as the time period in which the individual is observed and the individual's family background.

Thus, building on the literature presented above, the analyses will test the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Labour market exclusion, defined as both involuntary, (i.e. unemployment) and voluntary (i.e. inactivity), as well as objective job insecurity (proxied by temporary contracts) is expected to have a negative effect on the transition out of the parental home for both males and females in Italy. Thus, this hypothesis assumes a lower probability of exit from the parental home for individuals who are unemployed or inactive, but also for individuals who are employed with a temporary contract.

Hypothesis 2: The worsening of economic conditions, as a consequence of the crisis that occurred in 2008, has had a negative impact on the chances of leaving the parental household, in particular for those who are already disadvantaged. Thus, this hypothesis assumes that unemployed or inactive individuals, disadvantaged in the relative probability of exiting from parental home, if observed in the post-crisis period, may have lower chances of exit compared to peers observed in the pre-crisis period.

Hypothesis 3: A high educational background of parents (i.e. at least one parent with higher education) can positively support children exiting the parental home. Consequently, hypothesis 3 tests whether unemployed or inactive individuals belonging to highly educated families may have relatively higher chances of exiting compared to peers who come from low educated parents.

3. Data and Method

3.1 Data

The empirical analyses are performed using longitudinal data from the European Union Statistics on Income and Living Conditions database (EU-SILC). In order to take into consideration a large period of observation, which includes both the pre- and post-crisis periods, several waves of EU-SILC longitudinal data were pooled together, from EU-SILC 2007 (with observations starting in 2004 and ending in 2007) to EU-SILC 2014 (observations starting in 2010 and ending in 2014).

The EU-SILC longitudinal database follows individuals for a maximum of 4 years, per each wave. In order to avoid the risk of duplicating households when pooling together different waves, only individuals followed for 4 years were included, dropping cases of individuals followed for a shorter period, which might have appeared in several waves (Wirth, 2016).

The sample was composed of individuals residing in Italy, in the age range of 16 to 40, who lived with their parents at the beginning of the period of observation[1]. This is an extended age bracket compared to previous analyses carried out, but has been enlarged so as to increase the chances of observing exits from the parental home which, in the case of Italy, tends to occur at adult age, much later than in other European countries[2].

3.2 Study design

[1] Due to the structure of data, it is not possible to identify previous housing history of the individuals. Left censoring excludes information on possible previous episodes of independent living of the subject and possible returns home. Thus, we are not able to differentiate between first-time leavers and nest-returners.

[2] In 2015, the estimated average age of young people leaving the parental household in Italy was 30.1, against 26.1 in EU28 (Eurostat 2017, online code yth_demo_030, http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/submitViewTableAction.do).

The dependent variable is the event of exiting the parental household. Since literature highlighted a strong role played by marriage and – more recently – also by consensual unions in determining the pattern of exit from the parental home, the dependent variable is a categorical variable with three modes, in order to separate exit with a partner from exit without a partner. Thus, exit from the parental home has three modes: i) no exit; ii) exit with a partner (partner is a household member); iii) exit with no partner (partner is not a household member).
The information on living with parents (or not) is recorded in EU-SILC on a yearly basis, together with other time-varying covariates. This requires adopting a person-period scheme with a number of rows per each individual equal to the number of years in which he/she was followed (e.g. if the subject makes the transition in the second year, he/she has two rows in the dataset. If the subject is censored, namely the panel expires and the subject did not make the transition, he/she has 4 rows. Once the event occurs, the subject exits from the risk set and is no longer observable.

The main explicative variable included in the models is the *individual labour market situation*: a categorical variable, which combines information about employment status and type of contract in 5 modes:

- employed with permanent contract
- employed with temporary contract
- employed with missing information on contract[3]
- unemployed
- inactive (includes students and inactive individuals[4])

Other independent variables are:
a) *period of entry into the survey*: a categorical variable indicating the period in which the individual started to be followed (namely, the wave when he/she first appeared). The three categories are:
- *pre-crisis:* individuals who entered the survey between 2004-2006 (followed until 2007-2009)
- *during the crisis:* individuals who entered the survey in 2007-2009 (followed until 2010-2012)
- *post-crisis:* individuals who entered the survey in 2010-2011 (followed until 2013-2014)

b) *parental background:* a categorical variable as a proxy for the social status of the family of origin, operationalised as the highest level of education among father and mother:
- lower secondary (or less)
- upper secondary
- tertiary education.

For the purpose of this study, the parental background is proxied by the educational attainment of parents (the highest between father and mother). Social stratification studies take into consideration both educational attainment, social class, and income of the family of origin to grasp the effect of a whole set of parental resources on the opportunities of children (Breen, 2010; Goldthorpe and Jackson, 2007; Heckman, 2006). The three indicators are correlated among them, although research has highlighted that different types of capital (social, cultural, or economic) may exert different effects on different types of achievements of the offspring; and this effect may vary along the life course of the children (for a review see Erola et al., 2016). However, recent empirical research, although limited to Finland, has pointed out that such variation over the life course is small and that parental education is the strongest predictor when considering children's occupational achievement, followed by parents' occupational status, while parental income is the less important factor (Erola et al., 2016). Building on these findings, the analyses presented here use parental education as the proxy for parental background.

[3] It is a separate category created in order to check for the high number of missing values in the variable for the duration of contract, and not to lose sample size.

[4] The small sample size does not allow us to differentiate pure inactive individuals and students in two groups. Although heterogeneous, this category refers to the official ILO and Eurostat definitions of inactive people, which includes students, pensioners, and homemakers.

Finally, the models include some other **control variables**:
- *level of education of the individual*: a categorical variable with 3 modes indicating the highest level of education attained (lower secondary (or less); upper secondary; tertiary education)
- *age*: a categorical variable grouping into 3 modes the age range of the sample (young (16-24); young adults (25-34); adults (35-40))[5]
- *time to event*: a categorical variable to check for left censoring, which proxies the duration component of the model. Following Lersch and Dewilde (2015), the end of education is considered as the starting point for all individuals, and operationalized the variable in six categories, each made up of four-year intervals. Since EU-SILC did not provide information on the exact year when the individual left education, building on previous work done in this respect (Rokicka et al., 2015), imputed the typical age of the end of education for Italy and computed the years since the individual left education.

3.3. Data analyses

The method used for the empirical section was Event History Analysis, with models for discrete-time data (Bernardi, 2006; Box-Steffensmeier and Jones, 2004; Mills, 2011). Event history discrete time models estimate the hazard rate, which is defined as the probability that an event occurs at a particular time t, conditional on the fact that the event did not occur before t. The survival function expresses the probability that an event did not occur before time t (Mills 2011, p. 181).

Thus, the hazard function is expressed as follows: $h(t) = Pr(T = t \mid T \geq t)$ where T is the event time.

The survival function is represented as: $\hat{S}(t) = Pr(T > t \mid T \geq t) = 1 - h(t)$

When the dependent variable is binary and the time intervals are discrete (e.g.one-year interval) the recommended model was logit regression (Bernardi, 2006). However, in a context of competing risks as in the case under study, with different possible modes of exit, the dependent variable is operationalized into three different outcomes, and multinomial logistic regression models are applied. Multinomial logistic regression estimates the risk/opportunity of experiencing one of the three outcomes, conditional on a set of one or more independent variables. As for logistic regression, this risk/opportunity was represented as a set of probabilities ranging from 0 to 1.
In our case, the baseline category was a) 'no exit' and the comparison was carried out in the paper as follows: b) exit without a partner (outcome 2) vs. no exit (outcome 1); c) exit with a partner (outcome 3) vs. no exit (outcome 1).
In order to highlight the different patterns of exit that might emerge for men and women, separate discrete-time EHA models are presented for women and men.
Finally, since observations in a dataset organized according to a person-period scheme cannot be considered independent among them, observations are clustered based on the id of the unit of analysis. Although this issue was highly debated, with some authors recommending adjusting standard errors on the basis of clustered id (Bernardi, 2006), and some others (Allison, 1982; Mills, 2011) by ignoring the problem, the final decision is to use robust standard error clustered on individuals.

4. Findings

As a first step, this section presents some descriptive statistics of the event under analysis (exit from the parental home) and characteristics of the individuals who made the transition at the time of the event (Tables

[5] The hypothesis with a continuous variable for age was also tested, leading to very similar results.

1 and 2).
In total, in the sample and time range available, 980 individuals exited from the parental home (namely, no longer having their father or mother as part of their household), of which 506 exited with a partner, 474 with no partner. According to the descriptive statistics in Table 2, exits from the parental home without a partner occur more frequently among individuals who are employed (with almost no differences depending on the type of contract) and among adult individuals in the age range of 35-40. Similarly, exits from the parental home with a partner (no matter whether married or in a consensual union), tend to be more frequent among employed individuals (slightly higher for permanent contracts) and in the pre-crisis period.

Table 1 about here
Table 2 about here

Table 3 shows the estimates of the multinomial regression model for the three outcomes considered. The coefficients associated to the predictors indicate the relative probability of experimenting one type of exit over the reference outcome. The reference outcome is the group of those who never exit parental home in the 4-year period of observation, while the other two outcome categories are: exit alone (without a partner) and exit with a partner. Estimates in Model 1 refer to men and estimates in Model 2 refer to women. The single coefficients have to be read as the relative probability of exiting the parental home given certain characteristics (e.g. being a man and having a certain labour market situation in model 1) over the probability of not exiting (the baseline outcome).

Table 3 about here

Coefficients in Table 3 indicate a negative association between exclusion from the labour market (namely being unemployed or inactive) and the chances of exiting the parental home, both alone or in couple. As far as men are considered, the relative probability of exiting the parental home alone (rather than non-exiting) for unemployed and inactive men decreases compared to men employed with a permanent contract (the reference category). Similarly, the relative probability of exiting in a couple (rather than non-exiting) is lower for unemployed and inactive men than employed men with a permanent contract. The same relationship can be observed for women: the relative probability of exiting the parental home alone (compared to non-exiting) decreases for unemployed and inactive women compared to women employed with permanent contract. Similarly, being unemployed or inactive decreases the relative probability of exiting in a couple (rather than non-exiting) compared to employed women with a permanent contract.
However, differently to what has been hypothesized, the relative probability of exiting the parental home (both alone or in couple) for women and men employed with a temporary contract is not significantly different from that of individuals employed with a permanent contract (the reference category). This supports the first part of Hypothesis 1, the one assuming a negative association between labour market exclusion and the transition out of the parental home; but it does not support the second part of the hypothesis, assuming a negative association of objective job insecurity, at least as proxied by the type of contract.
With respect to the other dimensions considered, the period after the crisis and the educational background of the family of origin, the coefficients in Table 3 indicate a negative association between the post-crisis period and the chances of exiting the parental home in couple. Indeed, for men and women observed in the post-crisis, the relative probability of exiting in couple (rather than non-exiting) decreases compared to individuals observed in the pre-crisis period. However, when considering exiting alone, men show a slightly significant decrease in the relative probability of exiting compared to individuals observed before the crisis; while women do not show significant differences in the relative probabilities of exiting alone before and after the crisis. As far as the educational attainment of parents is considered, the estimates show a positive association between highly educated parents and the relative probability of exiting alone, but not with respect to exit in couple.

Indeed, for both women and men having highly educated parents increases the relative probability of exiting alone (rather than non-exiting) compared to their peers with low educated parents. However, in the case of exit with a partner, no significant differences are observable across the groups.

Since regression coefficients provide a partial overview of the relationships of interest, it can be useful to refer to average marginal effects in order to have a full and clearer picture of the associations between the predictor and the outcome variable (Leeper, 2018; Rodríguez, 2007; Williams, 2012).
As far as the primary variable of interest is concerned - individual's labour market situation-, figure 1 plots the average marginal effects (AMEs) of exiting the parental home, for women and for men, depending on the individual's labour market situation. The upper panel refers to exiting the parental home alone; the lower panel refers to exiting with a partner. In each graph the y axis represents the difference (in percentage points) in the likelihood of exiting the parental home for the different categories of individuals (represented on the x axis), with respect to the reference category. As an example, inactive women have 1.5 percentage points less probability of exiting the parental home alone (upper panel, second graph), compared to women who are employed with a permanent contract (the reference category). The dot indicates the difference in percentage points compared to the reference category; the upper and lower boundaries indicate the 95% confidence interval per each estimate. If the dot is below (above) zero it means that the category considered has a lower (higher) likelihood of exiting, compared to the reference category.

Figure 1 about here

With respect to the first type of transition, exiting the parental home alone (upper panel Fig.1) and the association with the individual's labour market situation, results do not differ for men and women, and confirm that in both cases unemployed and inactive individuals have lower probability of exiting compared to their employed peers. On the other hand, as observed in the regression table, individuals employed with a temporary contract do not show different (lower or higher) probability of exiting the parental home compared to their peers who are employed with a permanent contract.
When considering the other possible outcome, exit with a partner (lower panel Fig.1), results are similar. As before, both unemployed and inactive individuals have lower chances of exiting compared to their employed peers, while employed individuals with a temporary contract do not show a different probability compared to their employed peers with permanent contracts.
Overall, the magnitude of the association remains limited, with differences in percentage points that range around 1 or 2 percentage points for all categories, also due to the relatively small number of transitions observed. However, when comparing the two types of exit, it is interesting to note that, despite the small numbers, the relative disadvantage of unemployed and inactive men is greater in the case of exit in couple (about -1.5 percentage point vs. -1 p.p. or less in the case of exit alone). For women, instead, the disadvantage of unemployed women is stable around 1 p.p. in both cases, while inactive women have a greater disadvantage in the case of exiting alone (-1.5 p.p.).
Thus, as far as the individual's labour market situation is considered, it is possible to conclude that the relationship highlighted in the analysis partly goes in the direction of what is expected in Hypothesis 1: being excluded from the labour market (both in the case of involuntary, i.e. inactive, and involuntary exclusion, i.e. unemployed) is negatively associated to the transition out of the family of origin. The relationship is robust across gender and types of transition, meaning that being unemployed or inactive decreases the probability of exiting the parental home both in couple and alone, for women and for men, although the magnitude of the association remains limited. On the other hand, contrary to what is hypothesized, objective insecurity does not show any association with the probability of exiting the parental home. Namely, women and men who are employed with temporary contracts do not have lower chances of exiting the parental home compared to their peers who are employed, but with a permanent contract.

Then, the relationship between labour market situation and transition out of the parental home is further investigated by interacting the explicative variable with the indicator of structural conditions, i.e. the period of observation corresponding to the worsening of macro-economic conditions, and the proxy for socio-economic background, such as the educational attainment of parents.
At this point the analyses are focused on the interaction between these two variables and the most disadvantaged groups, unemployed and inactive individuals, who indeed showed lower chances of exiting the parental home compared to other categories of employed individuals (Figure 1).
Table 4 shows the estimates of the multinomial regression model including the interaction between the individual labour market status and the period of observation. The idea is to test whether their own relative probability to exit also changed over time, namely if unemployed individuals in the post-crisis period are more disadvantaged than unemployed people in the pre-crisis period.
In the case of *exiting alone*, the estimates for the interaction term do not provide any significant association between labour market status and period of observation, with some differences for men and women. Unemployed and inactive men keep having lower relative probability of exiting alone compared to employed men (although slightly significant for the unemployed) but this disadvantage does not significantly increase nor decrease during the periods of observation. For women this disadvantage is mainly experienced by inactive women, for whom a significant association with the period is observable in a further deterioration of the relative probability of exiting alone in the period of the crisis (2007-09) only.
In the case of *exiting with a partner*, instead, the interaction term shows a negative association of the labour market status with the post-crisis period, which deteriorates the relative probability of exiting in couple for both inactive women and men in the post-crisis period (2010 to 2014) compared to inactive individuals in the pre-crisis period. Unemployed men keep being disadvantaged but do not show a worsening of their disadvantage in the post-crisis period.
Thus, hypothesis 2 is only partially supported, inasmuch as the analyses indicate a deterioration of the relative probability of exiting in the post-crisis period for individuals excluded from the labour market, only in the case of exiting with a partner. The difference between the two types of exit seems to indicate that the worsening of the general economic conditions may influence the decision to leave parental home to form a family more seriously, and particularly for men, compared to the decision of exiting alone.

Finally, the analysis investigates whether a higher social origin of the family may play a role in supporting offspring's transition to autonomous living. As done before, the attention is on the two categories of individuals excluded (voluntary or involuntary) from the labour market, in order to test whether there may be some differences in the likelihood of exiting depending on different levels of socio-economic origin.
Table 5 shows the estimates of the multinomial regression models including the interaction term between individual's labour market situation and family background. Starting from the case of *exiting alone*, the model shows lower relative probability of exiting the parental home alone for men who are excluded from the labour market, with no differences based on the educational level of their parents. The interaction terms are not statistically significant, indicating no association between labour market status and parental education (e.g. unemployed men from highly educated parents do not have higher or lower chances of exiting alone compared to unemployed men from low educated parents). In the case of women, the same relationship is observed for inactive women, who experience a lower relative probability of exiting alone with no differences regarding parental education. However, an association between labour market status and parental education is observable for unemployed women of highly educated parents only (when also considering the main effects, they have lower relative probability of exiting alone compared to unemployed women from low educated parents).
An interesting emerging finding regards employed women with a temporary contract: those coming from families with high or medium educated parents show a negative interaction effect. This indicates that higher educational backgrounds are negatively associated to the chances of exiting alone for women employed with

temporary contracts. However, when also considering the main effects, the relative disadvantage involves daughters of medium educated parents only, who have lower relative chances of exiting the parental home, compared to low educated peers.
As far as the other type of transition is considered, *exiting with a partner*, the interaction with the educational background of the family of origin does not show any significance in influencing the chances of exiting the parental home. In summary, both women and men excluded from the labour market are disadvantaged (compared to employed peers) in the relative probability of exiting in couple, and this disadvantage does not significantly vary depending on different levels of socio-economic background of their parents. In this case the analysis does not provide support to the third hypothesis, assuming a supportive role of the family background.

5. Conclusions

This paper analysed whether, and to what extent, the labour market situation of young Italians affected their chances of exiting the parental home, considering a medium-term horizon. The paper also aimed to test whether contextual factors, such as the occurrence of the economic crisis of 2008, and family-related characteristics, such as the educational level of parents, might also have played a role in shaping the chances of exiting the parental home. Longitudinal data were analysed using discrete-time models, in order to estimate the hazard rate of leaving the parental home for a sample of Italian individuals in the age range of 16 to 40 who, at the beginning of the observation period, were living with their parents. The models were run separately for men and women, but the estimates showed that the patterns of exit did not diverge substantially across gender.

The main hypothesis of a negative effect of labour market exclusion (HP1) was supported by all our models, and was robust and consistent across genders (both men and women) and across transitions, with the condition of unemployment impacting negatively both on individual exit and exit with a partner. This is in line with previous literature (Blossfeld, and al. 2005, 2012) and could be explained by the low protection of income insecurity in Mediterranean countries, especially in Italy (Reyneri, 2017) in which job discontinuity coincides with discontinuity of income. Differently from previous studies (Blossfeld, 2005), the effect is the same for men and women: the male breadwinner model does not seem to be any more protective for females. The condition of inactivity emerged as negatively associated to exit from the parental home as well. In both cases the relationship may be driven by a common reason of a lack of economic resources for people who are excluded from paid work, but in the case of inactive individuals, it might also assume slightly different meanings for people who are in education (students), that traditionally stay at home in Italy until they finish their studies, and truly inactive people (not employed and not looking for job).
As far as objective insecurity is considered, proxied by being employed with a temporary contract, the estimates do not show any statistically significant association with the transition out of the parental home. Contrary to results of studies done in the pre-economic crisis, in which they found an effect of postponement of leaving the parental home in precarious conditions (Barbieri and Scherer 2009; Bernardi and Nazio, 2005,), this seems to indicate that what matters is the lack of job, rather than the type or stability of contract, in the decision to transit out of the family of origin. It may also indicate that having a temporary contract became perceived as a very normal situation for the young people, lasting beyond the first years of experimentation in the labour market and thus, after a certain age, young and young adults tend to leave the parental house even if in a precarious position. This does not automatically mean that precarious working conditions are no longer important, but rather, given the institutional and (especially) demographic constraints, young adults decide to make the transition anyway, despite insecure conditions. However, problems associated to insecure working conditions may affect subsequent transitions or may generate consequences later on in the life course of the individual. As an example, accepting a temporary or atypical job exposes young individuals to the risk of poverty in later stages of life, in particular with respect to savings and old-age pensions (Hofäcker et al., 2017),

as well as to a deterioration of their health and well-being (Voßemer et al., 2018).

Other factors have been taken into consideration, such as potentially mediating the association between the individual labour market situation and housing autonomy. The first one refers to an effect in the period associated to the aftermath of the economic crisis occurred in 2008. Given the worsening of the macro-economic conditions, the second hypothesis aims to investigate whether individuals who are observed in the post-crisis period (from 2010 to 2014) may have lower chances of exiting the parental home compared to their peers observed in a different period. When considering the chances of different groups of individuals, the relative disadvantage of unemployed and inactive people observed in different periods does not seem to vary, though with some gender differences. Indeed, the association between the individual labour market status and the period of observation does not provide any significant variation across periods for men, while for women it indicates a disadvantage of inactive women, which further deteriorates only in the crisis period. However, when considering the transition toward the formation of a new family with a partner, the relative probabilities of exiting in couple further decreased for inactive individuals, particularly for men, observed in the period after the crisis (2010-14). Thus, the worsening of economic conditions seems to have had an impact in particular on the chances of exiting with a partner (and particularly for men), decreasing or postponing long-term commitments, such as creating a family, for individuals excluded from the labour market. Uncertainty coming from their economic and work situation influenced the short-term decision process also in other dimension of their life, as previous studies showed, but also, and this is new, the typical model of male breadwinner diffused in Italy appears to be in crisis (Barbagli and al, 2004; Billari and al. 2005).
Finally, the analytical strategy tested whether an individual-level characteristic such as the socio-economic background of the family of origin may also play a role in such a transition. In fact, previous literature has highlighted that the availability of additional resources, in the form of monetary transfer or family properties may support children of better-off families in the transition to autonomous living. Another part of literature had underlined the *waiting strategy* of the sons of medium-high social classes. The results indicate that a higher educational background of the family of origin does not show any significant interaction effect with the labour market status of both men and women when the transition out of the parental home is made with a partner. In the case of exiting alone, the parental background does not show any interaction effect with the labour market status of men. However, in the case of women, it indicates a negative interaction only for unemployed women coming from highly educated parents. A negative interaction is also observed for women who are employed with a temporary contract, but when considering the overall effect, including the main effects, such disadvantage mainly involves women from medium-educated parents. These results, despite being limited only to some groups, e.g. unemployed women exiting alone, provide mixed evidence to the hypothesis of a waiting strategy (Fullin, 2005, Negri and Filandri, 2010) put in place by the offspring of better-off families who tend to stay in the family of origin longer, while waiting for a better position in the labour market.
In a society in which young people are the losers of globalisation and in which welfare state protection is very low, the labour market condition has an impact on the probability of leaving the parental home with potential negative risks. In Southern European countries, a late transition to independence tends to reduce the number of job experiences and the acquisition of practical skills, and generally has a negative impact on educational attainment and lifetime economic opportunities (Alesina and Giuliano 2007; Billari and Tabellini 2008).
The findings presented in this paper contribute to connecting two streams of literature, the one focussing on the role of labour market factors in decisions of housing autonomy (Blossfeld, and al. 2005), and the one considering the modes of such key transitions to adulthood (Barbagli and al, 2004; Billari and al, 2005)). Moreover, distinguishing between the transition out of the parental home in couple or without a partner is an original contribution that allows us to look at a new modality of becoming adult and a new way of reproduction of both inequality and a modality to form a new family in connection with labour market transformations.
At the same time, differentiating by the mode of leaving the parental home allows us to show that the worsening of general economic conditions had a negative impact, in particular on the decision of forming a new family.

The worsening of macro-economic conditions generates uncertainty and fear for the future especially in a context where adequate passive and active labour policies are lacking for young people, as well as a guaranteed minimum income, the result of which is that young people are effectively excluded from the greater part of the protections and alternate periods of work and unemployment. This situation is associated with a shortage of rental support policies and lack of access to credit for those with temporary contracts such as them, which could facilitate the purchase of a home. Faced with the very high risks that housing independence would entail, young people often fall back on the standard suggested by their parents (Tosi, 2017) to wait to leave home, until the housing conditions of exiting as a couple and owning a home are not achieved. This surely shelters them from the risks of poverty even if the rates of poor young families are increasing, but it can have consequences: first of all it limits the ability to aspire and plan. The space of experimentation offered to young people today is limited in job opportunities and institutional support.

This has in impact on private decisions and the fear of the future, especially for people who do not have a secure labour market condition. As the sociological literature highlighted, the long cohabitation with parents has the effect of parental influence on young people's decisions.

Finally, this work is not exempt from limitations and further empirical research investigating the drivers of the transition to housing autonomy should move along several directions. A first limitation is due to the limited window of observation, which in the case of EU-SILC, is limited to only 4 years and does not allow elaborating on the individual's prior history. Similarly, the sample size is small and information about the type of contract, in case the individual is employed, is not detailed beyond the binary dimension 'permanent' vs. 'temporary'. Thus, further empirical research may benefit from a deeper exploration of the determinants of housing autonomy combining more detailed information about the individual's labour market situation (e.g. more information on the type of contract or the real inactivity status) and about the cultural aspects of the process of exit, also employing qualitative material.

References

Aassve, A., Billari, F.C., Mazzuco, S. and Ongaro, F. (2002), "Leaving home: a comparative analysis of ECHP data", *Journal of European Social Policy*, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 259–275.

Aassve, A., Davia, M.A., Iacovou, M. and Mazzuco, S. (2007), "Does Leaving Home Make You Poor? Evidence from 13 European Countries", *European Journal of Population / Revue Européenne de Démographie*, Vol. 23 No. 3–4, pp. 315–338.

Allison, P.D. (1982), "Discrete-Time Methods for the Analysis of Event Histories", *Sociological Methodology*, Vol. 13, pp. 61–98.

Antonucci, L., Hamilton, M. and Roberts, S. (2014), *Young People and Social Policy in Europe: Dealing with Risk, Inequality and Precarity in Times of Crisis*, Palgrave Macmillan UK, available at: http://www.palgraveconnect.com/doifinder/10.1057/9781137370525 (accessed 28 April 2017).

Ascoli, U., Ranci, C. and Sgritta, G.B. (Eds.). (2015), *Investire Nel Sociale: La Difficile Innovazione Del Welfare Italiano*, ("*Investing in the Social Sphere: The Difficult Innovation Of Italian Welfare*"), Il mulino Publishers, Bologna.

Avery, R., Goldscheider, F. and Jr., A.S. (1992), "Feathered Nest/Gilded Cage: Parental Income and Leaving Home in the Transition to Adulthood", *Demography*, Vol. 29 No. 3, p. 375.

Baranowska-Rataj, A., Bertolini, S., Ghislieri, C., Meo, A., Moiso, V., Musumeci, R., Ricucci, R., et al. (2015), *Becoming Adult in Hard Times*, Accademia University Press, Torino, available at: https://books.google.com/books/about/Becoming_adult_in_hard_times.html?hl=it&id=Xt3oCwAAQBAJ (accessed April 10, 2017).

Barbagli, M., Castiglioni, M. and Dalla Zuanna, G. (2004), *Fare famiglia in Italia: un secolo di cambiamenti (Creating a family in Italy: a century of changes)*, Il Mulino, Bologna.

Barbera, F., Negri, N. and Zanetti, M. (2010), "Introduzione" (*Introduction*), in Negri, N. and Filandri, M. (Eds.), *Restare Di Ceto Medio (Remaining Middle Class)*, Il Mulino, Bologna, pp. 15–46.

Barbieri, P., Cutuli, G. and Scherer, S. (2014), "Giovani e lavoro oggi. Uno sguardo sociologico a una situazione a rischio", *SOCIOLOGIA DEL LAVORO ("Young people and work today. A sociological look at a risk situation ", SOCIOLOGY OF WORK)*, Issue # 136, pp. 73–98.

Becker, S.O., Bentolila, S., Fernandes, A. and Ichino, A. (2010), "Youth emancipation and perceived job insecurity of parents and children", *Journal of Population Economics*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 1047–1071.

Bernardi, F. (2006), *Análisis de la historia de acontecimientos*, Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas, Madrid.

Bernardi, F. and Nazio, T. (2005), "Globalization and transition to adulthood in Italy", in Blossfeld, H.-P., Mills, M., Klijizing, E. and Kurtz, K. (Eds.), *Globalization, Uncertainty and Youth in Society,* Routledge, London, pp. 347–372.

Barbieri, P. and Scherer S. (2009): *Labour market flexibilisation and its consequences in Italy*, *European Sociological Review* 25 (6), pp. 677-692.

Bertolini, S. (2011), "The heterogeneity of the impact of labour market flexibilization on the transition to adult life in Italy: When do young people leave the nest?", in Blossfeld, H.-P., Hofäcker, D. and Bertolini, S. (Eds.), *Youth on Globalised Labour Markets: Rising Uncertainty and Its Effects on Early Employment and Family Lives in Europe*, Barbara Budrich, Opladen & Farmington Hills, pp. 163–187.

Bertolini, S., Goglio, V., Moiso, V. and Torrioni, P.M. (2018a), "Leaving Home in Insecure Conditions. The Role of Labour Market Policies and the Housing Market in Europe", *Studies of Transition States and Societies*, Vol. 10 No. 3, available at: http://publications.tlu.ee/index.php/stss/article/view/606

Bertolini S., Hofacker D., Torrioni P.M., 2018b, "*Does contractual stability matter? The impact of labour market flexibilisation on on the first transition to adult life in France, Germany and Italy",* Journal of Studies of Transition States and Societies, Special issue: Youth transitions and social exclusion in Europe, Vol 10, No

3;

Bertolini S. (edited by), 2018, *Giovani senza un futuro? Insicurezza lavorativa e autonomia giovanile oggi in Italia*, Carocci, Rome;

Bettio, F., Plantenga, J. and Smith, M. (Eds.). (2013), *Gender and the European Labour Market*, Routledge, London ; New York.

Billari, F.C., Philipov, D. and Baizán, P. (2001), *Leaving Home in Europe. The Experience of Cohorts Born around 1960*, No. WP 2001-014.

Blossfeld, H.-P., Buchholz, S., Hofacker, D. and Bertolini, S. (2012), "Selective Flexibilization and Deregulation of the Labor Market. The Answer of Continental and Southern Europe", *Stato e mercato*, No. 3, pp. 363–390.

Blossfeld, H.-P., Klijzing, E., Mills, M. and Kurtz, K. (Eds.). (2005), *Globalization, Uncertainty and Youth in Society*, Routledge, London et al.

Box-Steffensmeier, J.M. and Jones, B.S. (2004), *Event History Modeling: A Guide for Social Scientists*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge ; New York.

Breen, R. (2010), "Educational Expansion and Social Mobility in the 20th Century", *Social Forces*, Vol. 89 No. 2, pp. 365–388.

Colombo E. e P. Rebughini P. , 2019, *The Politics of the Present*, Abingdon-on-Thames, Routledge.

Cordella, G. and Masi, S.E. (Eds.). (2012), *Condizione Giovanile e Nuovi Rischi Sociali: Quali Politiche?(Youth Condition and New Social Risks: What Policies?)*, Carocci publishers, Rome.

Corijn, M. and Klijzing, E. (Eds.). (2001), *Transitions to Adulthood in Europe*, Vol. 10, Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, available at:https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-015-9717-3.

Ermisch, J. (1999), "Prices, Parents, and Young People's Household Formation", *Journal of Urban Economics*, Vol. 45 No. 1, pp. 47–71.

Erola, J., Jalonen, S. and Lehti, H. (2016), "Parental education, class and income over early life course and children's achievement", *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, Vol. 44, pp. 33–43.

Eurostat. (2019a), "Data Explorer - Marriage indicators", *Eurostat.Ec.Europa.Eu*, available at: http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=demo_nind&lang=en (accessed 10 May 2019).

Eurostat. (2019b), "Data Explorer - Live births by mother's age and legal marital status", *Eurostat.Ec.Europa.Eu*, available at: http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=demo_fagec&lang=en; (accessed 10 May 2019).

Fernandes, A., Becker, S.O., Bentolila, S. and Ichino, A. (2008), "Income Insecurity and Youth Emancipation: A Theoretical Approach", *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, Vol. 8 No. 1, available at:https://doi.org/10.2202/1935-1682.1783.

Filandri M., Nazio T., 2017, The luck is in the family: Continued financial support after leavingthe nest in O'Reilly J., Moyart C., Nazio T., Smith M. (eds.) Youth Employment: STYLEHandbook, Brighton, CROME, http://style-handbook.eu

Franchi, M. (2005), *Mobili alla meta: i giovani tra università e lavoro,* Donzelli, Rome, available at: http://books.google.com/books?id=Fi7aAAAAMAAJ (accessed March 31, 2017).

Fullin, G. (2005), *Vivere l'instabilità del lavoro*, il Mulino, Bologna.

Gebel, M. (2009), "Fixed-Term Contracts at Labour Market Entry in West Germany: Implications for Job Search and First Job Quality", *European Sociological Review*, Vol. 25 No. 6, pp. 661–675.

Goldthorpe, J.H. and Jackson, M. (2007), "Intergenerational class mobility in contemporary Britain: political concerns and empirical findings1: Intergenerational class mobility in contemporary Britain", *The British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 58 No. 4, pp. 525–546.

Heckman, J.J. (2006), "Skill Formation and the Economics of Investing in Disadvantaged Children", *Science*, Vol. 312 No. 5782, pp. 1900–1902.

Hofäcker, D., Schadow, S. and Kletzing, J. (2017), *Long-Term Socio-Economic Consequences of Insecure Labour Market Positions*, No. 16, Tallinn University, Tallin, available at: http://www.except-project.eu/working-papers/.

Istituto Toniolo (edited by) (2017), *La condizione giovanile in Italia. Rapporto Giovani 2017*, Il Mulino, Bologna.

Leeper, T.J. (2018), *Interpreting Regression Results Using Average Marginal Effects with R's Margins*, available at: https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/margins/vignettes/TechnicalDetails.pdf.

Lennartz C., Arundel R., Ronald R. (2016), *Younger Adults and Homeownership in Europe Through the Global Financial Crisis*, in "Population, Space and Place", 22, pp. 823-835.

Lersch, P.M. and Dewilde, C. (2015), "Employment Insecurity and First-Time Homeownership: Evidence from Twenty-Two European Countries", *Environment and Planning A*, Vol. 47 No. 3, pp. 607–624.

McElroy, M.B. (1985), "The Joint Determination of Household Membership and Market Work: The Case of Young Men", *Journal of Labor Economics*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 293–316.

Mencarini Letizia and Tanturri Maria Letizia. (2006), "Una casa per diventare grandi. I giovani italiani, l'autonomia abitativa e il ruolo della famiglia d'origine", *Polis,* Vol. 3/2006, pp. 405–430.

Mills, M. (2011), *Introducing Survival and Event History Analysis*, SAGE, Los Angeles, Calif. ; London.

Mills, M. and Blossfeld, H.-P. (2003), "Globalization, uncertainty and changes in early life courses", *Zeitschrift Für Erziehungswissenschaft*, Vol. 6 No. 2, pp. 188–218.

Mulder, C.H. and Billari, F.C. (2010), "Homeownership Regimes and Low Fertility", *Housing Studies*, Vol. 25 No. 4, pp. 527–541.

Nazio, T. and Blossfeld, H.-P. (2003), "The Diffusion of Cohabitation among Young Women in West Germany, East Germany and Italy", *European Journal of Population / Revue Européenne de Démographie*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 47–82.

Negri, N. and Filandri, M. (Eds.). (2010), *Restare Di Ceto Medio: Il Passaggio Alla Vita Adulta Nella Società Che Cambia (Remaining Middle Class: The Passage To Adult Life In The Changing Society)*, Il mulino, Bologna.

Oppenheimer, V.K., Kalmijn, M. and Lim, N. (1997), "Men's Career Development and Marriage Timing During a Period of Rising Inequality", *Demography*, Vol. 34 No. 3, p. 311.

Parisi, L. (2008), "Leaving Home and the Chances of Being Poor: The Case of Young People in Southern European Countries", *Labour*, Vol. 22 No. s1, pp. 89–114.

Ranci, C., Brandsen, T. and Sabatinelli, S. (2014), *Social Vulnerability in European Cities: The Role of Local Welfare in Times of Crisis*, Palgrave Macmillan, available at: http://public.eblib.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=1725753 (accessed 10 April 2017).

Regini, M. (2000), *Modelli Di Capitalismo: Le Risposte Europee Alla Sfida Della Globalizzazione,*1st ed. Laterza Publishers, Rome; Bari.

Reyneri, E. (2017), Introduzione alla *sociologia del mercato del lavoro*, Il Mulino, Bologna.

Rizza, R. (2002), "Come cambia il lavoro autonomo : nuove forme contrattuali", *Economia & Lavoro (Economy and Labour)*, Vol. 36 No. 2, pp. 89–107.

Rodríguez, G. (2007), "A Note on Interpreting Multinomial Logit Coefficients", *GR's Website - Princeton University*, available at: https://data.princeton.edu/wws509/stata/mlogit (accessed 6 February 2019).

Rokicka, M., Kłobuszewska, M., Palczyńska, M., Shapoval, N. and Stasiowski, J. (2015), *Composition and Cumulative Disadvantage of Youth across Europe*, No. WP No.1, Tallinn University, Tallin.

Rusconi, A. (2006), *Leaving the Parental Home in Italy and West Germany: Opportunities and Constraints*, Shaker, Aachen.

Shanahan, M.J. (2000), "Pathways to Adulthood in Changing Societies: Variability and Mechanisms in Life Course Perspective", *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 667–692.

Tosi M. (2017), “Age norms, family relationships, and home-leaving in Italy”, *Demographic Research*, Vol. 36, pp. 281–306.

Voßemer, J., Gebel, M., Täht, K., Unt, M., Högberg, B. and Strandh, M. (2018), “The Effects of Unemployment and Insecure Jobs on Well-Being and Health: The Moderating Role of Labor Market Policies”, *Social Indicators Research*, Vol. 138 No. 3, pp. 1229–1257.

Williams, R. (2012), “Using the margins command to estimate and interpret adjusted predictions and marginal effects”, *Stata Journal*, Vol. 12 No. 2, pp. 308–331.

Wirth, H. (2016), “EU-SILC Data Structure and Documentation”, presented at the GESIS Training Course on EU-SILC, Mannheim, DE, 28 November.

Tables

Table 1 Number of events in the sample

	No.	**%**
no exit	9,490	90.6
exit with no partner	474	
exit with partner	506	
total exit	980	9.4
total individuals	10,470	100

Source: own calculation based on EU-SILC longitudinal database (UDB 2007-2014)

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of independent variables associated to the event (at time t_{event})

	exit no partner			exit with partner		
	N (event)	**N (total)**	**%**	**N (event)**	**N (total)**	**%**
LM status and contract						
employed with permanent contract	221	2,500	8.8	251	2,500	10
employed with temporary contract	75	954	7.9	79	954	8.3
employed (missing info on contract)	53	733	7.2	65	733	8.9
unemployed	55	1,537	3.6	45	1,537	2.9
inactive	70	4,746	1.5	66	4,746	1.4
Total	474	10,470	4.5	506	10,470	4.8
period of entry						
pre-crisis (entry 2007/2009)	232	4,618	5	279	4,618	6
crisis (entry 2010/2012)	172	3,829	4.5	183	3,829	4.8
post-crisis (entry 2013/2014)	70	2,023	3.5	44	2,023	2.2
Total	474	10,470	4.5	506	10,470	4.8
parental background						
at most lower secondary	220	4,843	4.5	279	4,843	5.8
upper secondary	175	4,249	4.1	179	4,249	4.2
tertiary	79	1,372	5.8	48	1,372	3.5
missing	0	6	0		6	0
Total	474	10,470	4.5	506	10,470	4.8
Control variables						
Gender						
male	257	5,721	4.5	240	5,721	4.2
female	217	4,749	4.6	266	4,749	5.6
Total	474	10,470	4.5	506	10,470	4.8
Age						
young (17-24)	88	5,540	1.6	48	5,540	0.9
young adults (25-34)	267	3,831	7	355	3,831	9.3
adults (35-40)	119	1,099	10.8	103	1,099	9.4
Total	474	10,470	4.5	506	10,470	4.8
Education						
at most lower secondary	97	3,680	2.6	124	3,680	3.4
upper secondary	258	5,571	4.6	275	5,571	4.9
tertiary	119	1,162	10.2	107	1,162	9.2
geographical area						
North & Centre	311	6,338	4.9	304	6,338	4.8
South & Islands	154	4,116	3.7	192	4,116	4.7
missing	9	16	56.3	10	16	62.5
Total	*474*	*10,470*	*4.5*	*506*	*10,470*	*4.8*

Source: own calculation based on EU-SILC longitudinal database (UDB 2007-2014)

Table 3. Multinomial Logistic regression coefficients, separate models for men and women

	Men	**Women**
no exit	*baseline*	*baseline*
exit no partner		
LM status (ref=employed & permanent)		
employed & temporary	-0.248	0.0167
	(0.214)	(0.198)
employed & missing	-0.272	-0.399
	(0.188)	(0.292)
unemployed	-0.701**	-0.790**
	(0.219)	(0.230)
inactive	-1.058**	-1.421**
	(0.228)	(0.241)
Crisis (ref=pre-crisis (entry 2004/06))		
crisis (entry 2007/2009)	0.0124	-0.125
	(0.137)	(0.154)
post-crisis (entry 2010/2011)	-0.348+	-0.308
	(0.191)	(0.204)
parental education (ref=at most lower secondary)		
medium (upper secondary)	0.266+	0.111
	(0.144)	(0.163)
high (tertiary)	0.642**	0.622**
	(0.197)	(0.205)
Control variables:		
geographical area (North/South), level of education, years since left education, age	Y	Y
Constant	-4.599**	-4.072**
	(0.322)	(0.301)
exit with partner		
LM status (ref=employed & permanent)		
employed & temporary	0.0357	-0.211
	(0.187)	(0.194)
employed & missing	-0.127	-0.190
	(0.176)	(0.237)
unemployed	-1.554**	-0.800**
	(0.293)	(0.215)
inactive	-2.474**	-0.771**
	(0.420)	(0.200)
Crisis (ref=pre-crisis (entry 2004/06))		
crisis (entry 2007/2009)	-0.133	-0.191
	(0.140)	(0.135)
post-crisis (entry 2010/2011)	-0.909**	-0.907**
	(0.236)	(0.228)
parental education (ref=at most lower secondary)		
medium (upper secondary)	0.109	-0.0241
	(0.150)	(0.146)
high (tertiary)	0.109	-0.145
	(0.233)	(0.233)
Control variables:		
geographical area (North/South), level of education, years since left education, age	Y	Y
Constant	-5.320**	-4.682**
	(0.378)	(0.323)
Observations	22266	18347
R2	0.0827	0.0769

Note: + p < 0.10, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01
Source: own calculation based on EU-SILC longitudinal database (UDB 2007-2014)

Table 4. Multinomial logistic regression coefficients, with interaction between labour market status and period of observation

	Exit no partner		**Exit with partner**	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
No exit	(baseline)	(baseline)	(baseline)	(baseline)
LM status (ref=employed & permanent)				
employed & temporary	-0.372	0.195	0.0531	-0.0186
	(0.320)	(0.290)	(0.256)	(0.265)
employed & missing	-0.431	0.213	-0.0169	-0.0232
	(0.269)	(0.367)	(0.225)	(0.340)
unemployed	-0.614+	-0.451	-1.565**	-0.430
	(0.314)	(0.321)	(0.425)	(0.278)
inactive	-1.243**	-1.041**	-2.196**	-0.470+
	(0.332)	(0.308)	(0.505)	(0.244)
Crisis (ref=pre-crisis (entry 2004/06))				
crisis (entry 2007/2009)	-0.110	0.298	0.000132	0.0746
	(0.192)	(0.232)	(0.181)	(0.209)
post-crisis (entry 2010/2011)	-0.381	-0.00492	-1.136**	-0.249
	(0.270)	(0.337)	(0.357)	(0.310)
Interaction LM status & crisis				
employed & temporary # pre-crisis				
employed & temporary # crisis	0.236	-0.473	-0.328	-0.368
	(0.455)	(0.421)	(0.405)	(0.415)
employed & temporary # post-crisis	0.230	-0.119	0.858	-0.657
	(0.606)	(0.528)	(0.571)	(0.637)
employed & missing # pre-crisis				
employed & missing # crisis	0.438	-1.166+	-0.340	-0.0359
	(0.402)	(0.644)	(0.390)	(0.483)
employed & missing # post-crisis	-0.0370	-1.760	0.0350	-14.82**
	(0.616)	(-1.113)	(0.704)	(0.464)
unemployed # pre-crisis				
unemployed # crisis	-0.226	-0.644	-0.110	-0.830+
	(0.477)	(0.478)	(0.635)	(0.458)
unemployed # post-crisis	-0.0106	-0.728	0.464	-0.786
	(0.565)	(0.718)	(0.897)	(0.700)
inactive # pre-crisis				
inactive # crisis	0.435	-0.922*	-0.531	-0.485
	(0.433)	(0.453)	(0.892)	(0.350)
inactive # post-crisis	0.0436	-0.446	-11.88**	-1.522*
	(0.635)	(0.557)	(0.623)	(0.679)
Controls: parents education, geographical area, age, years since end education	Y	Y	Y	Y
Constant	-4.558**	-4.275**	-5.330**	-4.842**
	(0.323)	(0.325)	(0.378)	(0.332)
Observations	22266	18347	22266	18347
R2	0.0843	0.0816	0.0843	0.0816

Note: + p < 0.10, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01
Source: own calculation based on EU-SILC longitudinal database (UDB 2007-2014)

Table 5. Multinomial logistic regression coefficients, with interaction between labour market status and parental education

	Exit no partner		**Exit with partner**	
	Men	**Women**	**Men**	**Women**
No exit	**(baseline)**	**(baseline)**	**(baseline)**	**(baseline)**
LM status (ref=employed & permanent)				
employed & temporary	-0.315	0.493+	0.0361	-0.271
	(0.316)	(0.272)	(0.258)	(0.279)
employed & missing	-0.488+	-0.654	-0.246	-0.157
	(0.286)	(0.484)	(0.244)	(0.310)
unemployed	-0.632*	-0.449	-1.664**	-0.781**
	(0.289)	(0.302)	(0.403)	(0.275)
inactive	-1.399**	-1.544**	-2.534**	-0.619*
	(0.430)	(0.393)	(0.721)	(0.244)
parental education (ref=at most lower secondary)				
medium (upper secondary)	0.198	0.179	0.0829	0.0346
	(0.194)	(0.249)	(0.192)	(0.213)
high (tertiary)	0.424	1.225**	-0.129	-0.00319
	(0.303)	(0.298)	(0.362)	(0.396)
Interaction LM status & parental education				
employed & temporary # low				
employed & temporary # medium	0.141	-0.969*	-0.189	0.118
	(0.453)	(0.452)	(0.409)	(0.417)
employed & temporary # high	0.169	-0.959*	0.534	0.0582
	(0.604)	(0.486)	(0.569)	(0.638)
employed & missing # low				
employed & missing # medium	0.475	0.836	0.221	-0.201
	(0.406)	(0.629)	(0.379)	(0.543)
employed &missing # high	0.251	-0.618	0.425	0.225
	(0.587)	(0.897)	(0.613)	(0.746)
unemployed # low				
unemployed # medium	-0.410	-0.376	0.252	-0.337
	(0.498)	(0.495)	(0.618)	(0.490)
unemployed # high	0.404	-1.625*	0.224	0.615
	(0.597)	(0.818)	-1.142	(0.635)
inactive # low				
inactive # medium	0.368	0.511	0.148	-0.143
	(0.526)	(0.465)	(0.933)	(0.346)
inactive # high	0.729	-0.751	0.0922	-1.025
	(0.588)	(0.582)	(1.272)	(0.662)
Controls: crisis, geographical area, age, years since end education	Y	Y	Y	Y
Constant	-4.558**	-4.209**	-5.301**	-4.723**
	(0.328)	(0.318)	(0.378)	(0.331)
Observations	22,266	18,347	22,266	18,347
R2	0.0840	0.0822	0.0840	0.0822

Note: + $p < 0.10$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$
Source: own calculation based on EU-SILC longitudinal database (UDB 2007-2014)